

REMARKS**Double Patenting**

Claims 1-9 and 31-45 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U. S. Patent No. 6,643,219 and claims 10-30 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-38 of U. S. Patent No. 6,665,232.

Included with the present Response, the Applicant has attached a Terminal Disclaimer complying with 37 CFR §3.73(b) in response the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-9 and 31-45 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-9 of U. S. Patent No. 6,643,219 and the Examiner's rejection of claims 10-30 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-38 of U. S. Patent No. 6,665,232.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting and allowance of claims 1-45.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2207.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/4/04



Andrew C. Walseth
Reg. No. 43,234

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T 612 312-2200
F 612 312-2250